



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,132	03/10/2004	Akihiro Mizutani	043118-0143	2059
22428	7590	11/13/2007	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW			2132	
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			MAIL DATE	
			11/13/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,132	MIZUTANI, AKIHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin E. Lanier	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed 23 October 2003 amends claims 7-12. Claims 13-16 have been added.

Election/Restrictions

2. Newly submitted claims 13-16 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
 - I. Claims 1-12, drawn to mode switching between public operation mode and personal operation mode, classified in class 713, subclass 166.
 - II. Claims 13-16, drawn to mode switching to a stand-by state after a time out period, classified in class 726, subclass 26.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as mode switching to a stand-by state. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
4. The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional

application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 13-16 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant argues, “There is not teaching or suggestion in Seroussi of switching operating modes, or even of more than one type of operation mode. Seroussi only teaches locking the

computer, or logging the user off and maintaining the computer in a log-in ready state (column 6, lines 46-47)[sic] There is no indication in Seroussi that the computer is able to operate in any other mode other than when a clinician is authenticated." This argument is not persuasive because when the computer of Seroussi is in the log-in ready state (i.e. no user has been authenticated), the computer is operating in a mode that reads on the claimed "public operation mode" since the computer permits "an indefinite number of users to operate" the computer. Meaning, any number of users can attempt to log-in to the computer when the computer is in a log-in ready state, and therefore meets the claim limitation.

10. Applicant argues, "There is further no teaching or suggestion in Seroussi of an operation setting mode, in which the operating mode of the computer is able to be set." This is not persuasive because computer can change from the log-in ready state to a specific authenticated user environment, and this operation is performed using functionality that means the claimed "operation mode setting section".

11. Applicant argues, "Seroussi teaches that the badge worn by the user has a sensor to detect if the badge has been detached by the user. This is in no way equivalent to a human body detection section of the image processing apparatus." This argument is not persuasive because since the badge is worn by a user (i.e. human body), then the sensor that detects the badge effectively detects the presence of wearer as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seroussi, U.S. Patent No. 6,836,843. Referring to claims 1, 7, Seroussi discloses an access control system using badge personal identification wherein when a user with a personal identification badge approaches a computer, the badge detects login signal that is periodically sent out by the computer (Col. 6, lines 46-52). The badge transmits a user id, stored on the badge, to the computer (Col. 8, lines 35-37). The computer receives the user id and authenticates the user for access by comparing the user id with a list of authorized ids (Col. 7, lines 50-59 & Col. 8, lines 39-44, 54-59), which meets the limitation of a user authentication section that acquires ID information to identify each user from among a plurality of users, and performs user authentication based on said ID information. The badge also contains user permissions used by the computer when user is provided access to the system (Col. 4, lines 40-46), which meets the limitation of a personal operation mode to permit each user to operate individually. If the authorized user is physically away from the computer for a predetermined period of time, the computer logs the user off, and enters a ready mode (Col. 9, lines 12-21) that allows for a new user to login to the computer in same manner as the other user (Col. 6, lines 9-13, 46-52), which meets the limitation of an operation mode setting section that can selectively set, as an operation mode that sets a work environment for operation inputs, between a personal operation mode to permit each user to operate individually and a public operation mode to permit an indefinite number of users to operate, a mode switching section that, when a user is authenticated in said

user authentication section, switches said operation mode from said public operation mode into said personal operation mode for the authenticated user.

Referring to claims 2, 8, Seroussi discloses that if the authorized user is physically away from the computer for a predetermined period of time, the computer logs the user off, and enters a ready mode (Col. 9, lines 12-21) that allows for a new user to login to the computer in same manner as the other user (Col. 6, lines 9-13, 46-52), which meets the limitation of said mode switching section switches said operation mode from said personal operation mode into said public operation mode based on a prescribed condition with the state that a current operation mode is set to said personal operation mode.

Referring to claims 3, 9, Seroussi discloses that once logged in the user badge receives challenges from the computer that includes a counter and random number (Col. 9, lines 1-12). The badge responds to the challenge with an incremented counter value and the random number (Col. 9, lines 21-26), which meets the limitation of ID information because the counter/random number combination is sufficient to identify the user whom the challenge was initially sent. If the computer does not receive a challenge within a predetermined period of time, the computer logs the user off, and enters a ready mode (Col. 9, lines 12-21) that allows for a new user to login to the computer in same manner as the other user (Col. 6, lines 9-13, 46-52), which meets the limitation of when ID information is not required for a period of time longer than a predetermined time in said user authentication section, said mode switching section switches said operation mode from said personal operation mode into said public operation mode with the state that a current operation mode is set to said personal operation mode.

Referring to claims 4, 10, Seroussi discloses that if the authorized user is physically away from the computer for a predetermined period of time, the computer logs the user off, and enters a ready mode (Col. 9, lines 12-21) that allows for a new user to login to the computer in same manner as the other user (Col. 6, lines 9-13, 46-52), which meets the limitation of a human body detection section that detects a user located in the vicinity of said image processing apparatus, wherein when a human body has not been detected by said human body detection section for a period of time longer than a predetermined time, said mode switching section switches said operation mode from said personal operation mode into said public operation mode with the state that a current operation mode is set to said personal operation mode.

Referring to claims 5, 11, Seroussi discloses that the badge also contains user permissions used by the computer when user is provided access to the system (Col. 4, lines 40-46), which meets the limitation of a setting information acquisition section that acquires setting information associated with each user, wherein said operation mode setting section sets said personal operation mode based on said setting information associated with the user authenticated in said user authentication section.

Referring to claims 6, 12, Seroussi discloses that the badge transmits a user id, stored on the badge, to the computer (Col. 8, lines 35-37). The computer receives the user id and authenticates the user for access by comparing the user id with a list of authorized ids (Col. 7, lines 50-59 & Col. 8, lines 39-44, 54-59), which meets the limitation of said ID information cooperates with login IDs in a network that can be connected to said image processing apparatus, where said image processing apparatus further comprises a personal information processing

section that performs the processing of personal information relevant to the users corresponding to said ID information existing on said network based on said ID information.

Conclusion

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin E. Lanier whose telephone number is 571-272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Benjamin E. Lanier



GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100